

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the phrase "determining whether to initiate call setup for the mobile station prior to the second authentication procedure completing successfully" is not disclosed by the specification.

Claim 1 has been amended to delete this phrase and to add "determining whether the first parameter indicates that the first authentication procedure completed successfully; and when the first parameter indicates that the first authentication completed successfully, initiating call setup before the second authentication procedure has completed." Applicants assert that this language is taken from former claim 2, which the Examiner stated is allowable. Applicants further assert that amended claim 1 is allowable because none of the art cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests a method of reducing fraudulent access to communication system resources by a mobile station comprising the combination of the steps claimed and in particular do not teach the limitations of "determining whether the first parameter indicates that the first authentication procedure completed successfully; and when the first parameter indicates that the first authentication completed successfully, initiating call setup before the second authentication procedure has completed."

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Broyles et al. (US 6,665,530). On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner states

Broyle et al teach on column 6 line 26 to column 8 line 7, the mobile station's access is delayed (reads on claimed "determining not to initiate call setup") until (claimed "prior to") the unique challenge authentication is completed successfully. Broyle et al clearly teach "a determining step" which concludes to delay the mobile station's access until the unique challenge authentication is completed successfully.

As noted by the Examiner, Broyles et al. teaches delaying the mobile station's access to the system until the authentication has completed successfully. In contrast, amended claim 1 recites "initiating call setup before the second authentication procedure has completed." Thus, Broyles does not anticipate claim 1 or claim 5 (which is dependent on claim 1).

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles in view of US 2001/0025345 (Jung). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles as applied to claim 1, and in view of Jung, and further in view of Patel (US 6,591,364). Applicants submit that neither Broyles or Jung, alone or in combination, teach all of the limitations of claim 1 for the reasons set forth above with respect to Broyles. Applicants further submit that claims 5 and 6 are now allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,  
Carey, Christopher et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department  
1303 East Algonquin Road  
IL01/3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 22917

By:   
Lalita W. Pace

Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No.: 39,427

Telephone: 847-538-5855  
Fax No.: 847-576-3750

BEST AVAILABLE COPY